IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY SIXTH DAY OF NOVEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MS JUSTICE G.ROHINI

WRIT PETITION No.8095 of 2000

Between:

1. T.Madavi, D/o T. Bagavan Rao, R/O Ashok Nagar, Bellampalli.

2. R.Rajkumar S/o R.Ramaiah, R/o opp. Caltex, Bellampalli.

3. S.Jagdish Kumar S/o Madanaiah, R/o opposite Railway Station, Bellampalli.

4. K.Sujatha, W/o Satyanarayana, c/o Vegetable Market, Bellampalli.

5. V.Satyanarayana S/o Lachaiah, R/o Post office road, Bellampalli.

6. L.Prabhakar, S/o Rajaiah, C/o Mahesh Medical Store, Bellampalli.

7. Abdul Sabab W/o Wahab, R/o Masjid Complex, Bellampalli.

8. K.Vallabai S/o Lachi Reddy, R/o Caltex, Bellampalli.

..... PETITIONERS

AND

1. The Telecom District Manager, Department of Telecommunication Services, Adilabad.

2. Accounts Officer (TR) C/O T.D.M., Adilabad.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to

issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in issuing the impugned demand notice No.TRA/ADB/BMP.22388 dated 2.3.2000, 2) TRA/ADB/BMP NO.22395 dated 2.3.2000, 3) TRA/ADB/99-2000 dated 5.2.2000, 4) TRA/ADB/99-2000 DATED 5.2.2000, 5) TRA/ADB/99-2000 dated 5.2.2000, 6) TRA/ADB/99-2000 dated 5.2.2000, 7) TRA/ADB/99-2000 dated 5.2.2000, 8) TRA/ADB/99-2000 dated 5.2.2000 and other letters of the individuals, as illegal, arbitrary and in violation of the rules and regulations of the Act and also in violation of principles of natural justice and consequently set aside the demand notices issued for collection of additional security deposit from the petitioners.

Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.J.CH.Y.NARASIMHAM (not present)

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 and 2: MR.M.GANGA RAO

The Court made the following :

ORDER:

There was no representation for the petitioners on 25.11.2004 and, therefore, the matter is listed today under the caption “for dismissal”. Even today none appeared for the petitioners. Obviously the petitioners are not interested in prosecuting the matter.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed for non-prosecution. No costs.

_____

26.11.2004

sh

To

1. The Telecom District Manager, Department of Telecommunication Services, Adilabad.

2. Accounts Officer (TR) C/O T.D.M., Adilabad.

3. 2CD copies.